

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Farmer WO 02/39486 (“Farmer”). Claims 7, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farmer in view of Yung et al. (US 6,909,974) (“Yung”). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Farmer, Applicant asserts that Farmer does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that Farmer fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 8 and 16).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a database for storing a list of available Web services, wherein each listed Web service includes a description of a task performed by the Web service and an input signature and an output signature of the Web service, wherein the Web service comprises a computer program accessible over the World Wide Web.” Farmer does not teach these features.

The Office cites to Figure 3 and paragraphs 0018, 0022, 0051, 0057, 0058 and 0062 of Farmer in support of its allegations. More specifically, these citations do not teach “a database for storing a list of available Web services.” Farmer states “The Services Broker allows components to request and provide services to one another..” [0018] In reviewing the cited references, it appears the Office means to equate “Services Broker” of Farmer with Applicant’s “database for storing a list of available Web services.” A broker is an intermediary and is described as such by Farmer in stating the Services Broker requests and provides services. Farmer does not teach the Services Broker as storing any information but rather as a go-between for services. A database stores information and specifically Applicant’s database stores a list of available Web services. Accordingly, Farmer does not teach “a database for storing a list of available Web services.” For this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 (and similarly claims 8 and 16) is not anticipated by Farmer.

Further, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a selecting system for forming the chain of Web services by selecting a Web service from the list of available Web services for each of a plurality of tasks in the workflow.” Farmer does not teach each of these features.

The Office cites to Figure 11 and paragraphs 0040, 0053, 0060, 0061, 0062 and 0063 of Farmer in support of its allegations. More specifically, these citations do not teach “selecting a Web service from the list of available Web services for each of a plurality of tasks in the workflow.” The citations to Farmer do not teach anything related to “tasks in the workflow.” Rather the citations to Farmer appear to address “interface components” for various classes of databases. In particular, see [0061] which states

“an interface can be defined for each of the fundamental classes” and [0058] “these fundamental classes tend to reflect stable and established models and concepts” with examples that discusses the entities of three genome related databases. Examined in its entirety, Farmer does not teach “selecting a Web service from the list of available Web services for each of a plurality of tasks in the workflow.”

Further, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the selecting system dynamically matches the input signature of a first Web service with the specified input of the workflow and the output signature of the first Web service with the input signature of an adjacent Web service and the output signature of a second Web service with the specified output format to ensure that each selected Web service is compatible with the adjacent Web service in the chain of Web services and the specified input and output formats.” Farmer does not teach each of these features.

The Office cites to Figures 3 and 11 and paragraphs 0022, 0057, 0058, 0061, 0062, and 0071-0076 of Farmer in support of its allegations. The citations to Farmer provided by the Office do not teach the matching of Web services based upon their respective input and output signatures. Rather the citations provided and the counter-arguments made by the Office state the messages between invoked programs are wrapped with a simple Java class. [0071] and Final Office Action p.12. Farmer states “This Java wrapper handles the broadcast and reception of integrated system events and transmits them in terms the program can understand.” [0071] The Office states “This is accomplished by the execution of a chain of Web services involving wrapping the messages passed within the system in a simple Java class for communication.” Final Office Action p.12. To the extent the Office equates the invoked programs of

Farmer with the selected Web services of Applicant, Farmer does not teach the dynamic matching of input and output signatures. Thus, Farmer does not teach these features.

For all of these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 (and similarly claims 8 and 16) is not anticipated by Farmer.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: May 29, 2008

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)